

On the Dual Meaning of Manner-of-Speaking  
Verbs and the That-Clause Complement ( )  
Summaries of the Papers Read at the  
Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Tsukuba  
English Linguistic Society )

著者	Kogusuri Tatsuya, Kitahara Ken-ichi, Yoshida Nobukatsu [ et al. ]
journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	26
page range	141-142
year	2007-09-20
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2241/91362">http://hdl.handle.net/2241/91362</a>

**Summaries of the Papers Read at the Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of  
the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society**

## On the Dual Meaning of Manner of Speaking Verbs and the *That*-Clause Complement

Tetsuya Kogusuri, Ken-ichi Kitahara, Nobukatsu Yoshida, and Momoko Kodaira

In this joint research, we examine the syntactic behavior of *that*-clause complements taken by manner of speaking verbs (henceforth, MSV), as is exemplified in (1):

- (1) Maggie murmured/whispered that it was a mistake.

MSVs can take a *that*-clause as their complement as well as verbs of saying (e.g. *John said that there were cockroaches in the caviar*). However, these two types of verbs differ with respect to the availability of the intransitive use:

- (2) a. Maggie murmured/whispered.  
b. \*John said/mentioned.

This contrast indicates that the *that*-clause taken by the MSV in (1) may appear optionally, while that of the verb of saying may not. Therefore, it seems to follow that the former is syntactically distinct from the latter.

In fact, the clausal complement of the MSV differs from that of *say* in various ways. Firstly, in the case of MSVs, *Wh*-extraction from the embedded clause is impossible:

- (3) a. \*What did John whisper that he lost?  
b. What did John say that there were in the caviar?

(Kuwabara and Matsuyama (2001:29))

As shown in (3a), the object NP within the *that*-clause cannot be extracted. By contrast, *Wh*-extraction from the *that*-clause is possible in the case of *say*, as in (3b). Secondly, the complementizer *that* in (1) cannot be omitted, whereas the omission is possible in the *that*-clause of *say*, as in (4):

- (4) a. Francis whispered \*(that) we should turn down the stereo.  
b. John said (that) there were cockroaches in the caviar.

(Kuwabara and Matsuyama (2001:28))

Thirdly, the sentential complement of an MSV cannot be passivised, as the following illustrates:

- (5) a. \*It was shouted by Morris that night was falling. (Zwicky (1971:232))  
b. It is said that Bill is honest. (Tanaka (1991:71))

These data thus lead us to assume that, despite having the similar appearance, the *that*-clause of the MSV has the rather different syntactic property from that of *say*.

However, the clausal complement of MSVs may have the property close to that of *say* (cf. Stowell (1981)). In particular, the sentences in (6) are regarded as

acceptable, a case where the extraction does apply to the object NP within the sentential complement of the MSV (cf. (3a)):

- (6) a. What did John just whisper to you that he ate? (Stowell (1981:406))
- b. Who did Bill mutter that he doesn't like? (ibid.)

These examples strongly argue against the distinction between MSVs and *say* with respect to the syntactic property of the *that*-clause complement.

According to Zwicky (1971:223), MSVs are characterized as “referring to intended acts of communication by speech and describing physical characteristics of the speech act.” Given this characterization, we can hypothesize that the meaning of an MSV consists of two correlated components, i.e. speech and manner. If this is correct, the two different behaviors of the clausal complement, as in (3a) and (6), can be accounted for in terms of which semantic component of the verb the speaker focuses on in the discourse. More specifically, the manner component of the MSV is focused on by default, which results in the behavior of the clausal complement, as in (3)-(5). On the other hand, when one focuses on the speech component, the behavioral property of the *that*-clause shifts close to the one of *say*, as in (6).

In fact, our hypothesis based on the focalization of the semantic component is borne out by the following examples:

- (7) Whenever John met his girlfriend, he whispered (to her) that he loved her.
- (8) a. He whispered he loved her.
- b. (The fact) That he loved her was whispered by John.

In (7), *whenever John met his girlfriend* establishes the repeated and accustomed situation. In this case, John's whispering his love to her may be interpreted as his habit, so that the manner of the action is not focused. Therefore, it is the communication act (i.e. conveying some specific content) that is highlighted in the action denoted by the verb. In other words, the speech component is focused on in the given situation. As a result, the speech-focused context ameliorates the applicability of Complementizer Deletion in (8a) and Passivization in (8b). Put simply, the appropriate contextual information as in (7) would enhance the acceptability of the syntactic behaviors as in (8), which is comparable to the *that*-clause of *say*. Thus, the hypothesis that MSVs have the dual semantic property, i.e. speech and manner, enables us to give a systematic account for the different syntactic behaviors shown above.

From the discussion so far, it is concluded that the syntactic behavior of the *that*-clause complement of the MSV varies with respect to which semantic component of the verb, i.e. speech or manner, is focused on.